

Identity

Magazine of the British National Party

BNP Pressure Makes Immigration The Election Issue

» Racist Crime In London
P 10

» Ten Axions Of
Economic Nationalism
P 08





March's News

» Europe's 'Invisible Hand'

"Europe's power is easy to miss. Like an 'invisible hand' it operates through the shell of traditional political structures. The British House of Commons, British Law Courts and British civil servants are still here, but they have become agents of the European Union implementing European law. This is no accident. By creating common standards that are implemented through national institutions, Europe can take over countries without necessarily becoming a target for hostility."

Who wrote the above, Nick Griffin or an unusually perceptive UKIP MEP?

No! It was written by Mark Leonard, the foreign policy director of the Centre for European Reform, a leading pro-EU think tanks, in its latest bulletin.

» Brown's Boost For Civil Servants

Responding to the public's (and the BNP's) concern over New Labour's rising tide of bureaucrats, Gordon Brown announced a few months back that he would be cutting the number of civil servants by 70 to 80 thousand. Latest official figures reveal that he will have added a net 860,000 to the public payroll within the next three years! Only one in six of those will be teachers, policemen, nurses or other frontline workers.

» Stealing Africa's Nurses

For some time the Royal College of Nursing has been warning that with nearly half of all new nurses in Britain coming from overseas this is a short-term solution which cannot be sustained. It says that the influx from places such as the Philippines, Southern Africa and India is leaving those countries' health services dangerously short of trained staff.

A BBC report last month said that in Malawi, facing a staggering health crisis, mainly from HIV, around 60

nurses are trained each year. But at least 100 others leave to work in other countries, particularly the UK.

Meanwhile, native British nurses and doctors are moving to America for realistic salaries that reflect their expertise and dedication, and new nurses are not being attracted by the poor salaries on offer. The BNP would pay realistic wages to all medical staff to ensure we retain 'the best of British'. Paid for by making the NHS a truly National Health Service and not a World Health Service (our phrase, not Mr Howard's)

» One Child In Six Is Ethnic

In a report issued on 28/01/05 by the Department of Education and Skills it was revealed that in 2004, 17 per cent of the maintained school population in England was classified as belonging to a minority ethnic group. It added that the minority ethnic school population had grown by an estimated fifth to a third in numbers since 1997.

In comparison, there has been a much smaller increase of 2.3 per cent in the total number of pupils in maintained schools. The report was titled "Ethnicity and Education: The Evidence on Minority Ethnic Pupils".

What particular group most of these school children belong to is indicated in the recent findings of the Office For National Statistics on the most popular boys name's. Mohammed was in the top ten, if one included the different ways of spelling the name.

» "BNP Activists Face House Arrest"

Now that Home Secretary Charles Clarke is pushing through new 'anti-terrorist' laws, including house arrest, to be in force before the election, confirmation of Nick Griffin's claim in last month's *Identity* that it was also intended to hit the BNP has come in a report from *The Scotsman* of 27/01/05. Its heading was 'BNP and animal rights activists face house arrest'. It opened

with: "Controversial new laws to tackle international terrorism could be used to put British National Party members and animal rights activists under house arrest without criminal trial".

» A Journalist With Principles

As reported in the January editorial of *Identity*, *The Spectator* of January 1st had an amazing article by Rod Liddle on the arrest of Nick Griffin and other BNP people on suspicion of inciting racial hatred. 'Amazing' in that the article could have come from the pages of this magazine despite the usual liberal opinions of the honest Rod Liddle.

He's been at it again, writing a comment column for the *Sunday Times*, 20/02. It was headed "Things I shouldn't say about black people."

"There are some things that you can say and there are some things that you can't say. Paradoxically, they are sometimes the same things. For example, did you know that black and Asian women commit far more crime than their white counterparts? Almost one third of the total female British prison population is drawn from black and Asian communities.

"Now, that's one of the things you can't say, or shouldn't say, unless you're the British National party."

Rod Liddle went on to substantiate his claim and to show that Black and Asian women are not discriminated against in employment and actually received higher wages than their white counterparts.

Identity

Editor: John Bean
February 2005

Public reference:
ISSN 1469-7971

Subscriptions Dept:
PO Box 87, Ossett
Wakefield, WF5 8WN
Tel: 0870 75 73 267.

Please note that we receive more material than we can publish. Articles should be submitted to the addresses below in typed/electronic format.
PO Box 97, Newmarket,
Suffolk CB8 1WT.
Email: Identitymatters@yahoo.co.uk.

The BNP Made Immigration The Election Issue

» With only two months to go before the General Election immigration remains the key issue. What BNP election workers, and particularly our canvassers, must put across to the electorate in the hundred plus seats we are fighting is that it is the BNP who has brought discussion of the effects of immigration into the public domain. And if there was any true justice in our political world we should at last be rewarded with two or three Parliamentary seats, instead of being treated as criminals by the old parties and their kept media, for doing so. However, such rewards are likely to be delayed until next year's local elections.

Over many years the British National Party has successfully shaken off those 'supporters', mainly given to beer bar rhetoric, whose concept of dealing with the problems of mass immigration was to abuse immigrants themselves. They provided the sticks that the media were only too ready to pick up and beat us with. However, the pragmatic approach pursued by the BNP leadership over the past five years not only meant that media abuse has become subject to the law of diminishing returns in its effectiveness, but astounded the old parties by bringing several electoral victories.

First there was Burnley, where currently we have six Councillors. This has been followed by further Council election victories in Yorkshire, the West Midlands and, importantly, in London's Essex and Herts outer suburbs, giving us a total of 25 Councillors. An immediate reward to the people of Burnley and Oldham (where BNP candidates scored several close second places) was that the New Labour Government stopped sending asylum seekers to those towns.

The first signs that the old parties were becoming aware that their multicultural dream was being rejected by the electorate and that the BNP looked likely to gain most from this, came in the run up to last June's Euro election campaign. Following advice from the PR guru Max Clifford (although he always votes Labour), the UK Independence Party decided to make strong noises about asylum seekers. Until then UKIP, supported by many decent patriots in calling for Britain's withdrawal from the EU, had not mentioned immigration in its ten years of existence, other than for its leaders to commit themselves to accepting Britain's multiracial society and to abuse us for not doing so.

This was just what the media mouthpieces of the old parties were looking for. UKIP, further boosted by the support of ex-Labour MP and TV presenter Kilroy-Silk, received acres of newsprint and TV news exposure as being "firm on immigration" whilst the BNP were lucky to get two column inches. It worked, and the old gang breathed sighs of relief that although the BNP still picked up nearly a million votes, seats in the European



Parliament, and the money that goes with them, had been denied us.

Learning from UKIP's success and the BNP's spade work in bringing the subject into public debate, Michael Howard and the Tory Party now talk tough on immigration in the hope that this will bring them extra votes at the General Election. But, as stated on this page last month, to reduce immigration to around 50,000 a year (which he proposes) is now far too late. The fact that it is just another Tory con trick is shown in this paragraph from an article Mr Howard wrote for the *Daily Telegraph* 28/01/05:

"Modern Britain is immeasurably better off as a result of the new Britons who have made their homes here over the last century. We all benefit from the social diversity, economic vibrancy and cultural richness which immigration has brought." Is this being "tough on immigration"?

Effects on Housing, NHS, and Education

At least 60 per cent of the electorate agrees with the BNP's stance on immigration. However, many will say: "This is a General Election and you must offer more than just stopping immigration and withdrawing from the EU." The readers of this magazine and *Freedom*, and the thousands who visit the BNP website daily, know that we have policies on all the other issues affecting our people, but the public at large does not. But canvassers and candidates talking to the local press can emphasise immigration's harmful effects on housing, the NHS and Education.

Take housing alone, with the white British birth rate falling below replacement level we would not need the extra housing that is destroying our shrinking countryside. Additionally, the rising demand that immigration past and present has aggravated is responsible for the escalation in house prices.

John Bean



» Nick Griffin repeats some advice he gave recently to several Young British National Party members choosing their subject options at school. But his ideas on the likely future of our struggle are relevant to nationalists of all ages who are serious about helping our rebellion against the evil which dominates our land

CAREER OPPORTUNITIES?


» The West in general, and Britain in particular, are in mortal danger. The rot has gone so far that old-fashioned defensive conservatism cannot save us. Salvation lies in sweeping political and cultural transformation through every aspect of society. Such change can only be carried out by a movement which - while avoiding wild rhetoric and puerile sloganising - is self-consciously revolutionary in purpose. That movement, in turn, can only be built by individual nationalist revolutionaries: people like you.

Assuming that you are serious about our task, and your determination to be part of it, the only question to be decided before settling on your future career path is which of the several roads you can take will turn you into the most effective fighter for our Cause, and allow you to sustain your efforts - and to raise a family at the same time - over the crucial next two decades.

A number of nationalist theorists have begun their own recommendations in this field by observing the success of the pre-war Fabian/ Marxist policy of infiltration and targeted recruitment which gave the Communist Party so much influence in key sections of the Establishment including the BBC, education system and the Church. Others have drawn inspiration from the Gramscian/Maoist "long march through the institutions" which has turned scruffy and powerless 1968-generation students into Prime Ministers, Finance Ministers, Judges and Chief Constables all over Europe, allowing them to impose their genocidal social, cultural and ethnic agendas on our entire society.

Such success in imposing a leftist revolution by stealth is obviously impressive from a tactical point of view, and there are clearly lessons still to be learnt from the application of Lenin's recommendation for disposing of a large enemy salami-style - one slice at a time.

But as a guide for young patriots



deciding what career to follow, the "long march" over several generations is useless. Why? Because we don't have the luxury of several generations. On present trends, either we build the power-winning machine needed to put us in the position to turn things around within twenty years, or it will be too late.

The impact of our growing success is quite likely to force the liberal elite to slow down the rate of our dispossession, thereby buying us a few more years in which to do what has to be done, but the birth-rate differential is so great that even slamming the doors shut tomorrow would not be enough to prevent the eclipse of our Western culture and ethnic identity before today's students

could become the teachers and lecturers of the next generation which would supposedly bring home the revolution.

Time's up for the West. Unfortunately - fortunately if you enjoy living in interesting times - for current readers, the burden of saving our civilisation and the people who built it falls on this generation. The decision will be made in our lifetimes, either by us or as a result of our failure to meet the challenge.

This not only rules out the old leftist route to power by capturing the Establishment from within, it also effectively removes worries about pension plans and paying for your children's university education half a



lifetime in the future. In the strife-torn Third World Islamic Republic which will be dawning in Britain by then if we don't win, pensions and tuition fees will be the last things on your family's mind.

Your decision as to your future career can therefore be made with one single question in mind: What am I suited to do which will maximise my value to the nationalist movement?

In answering that question, the key thing is to understand the nature of the System we are struggling to overthrow, the pillars on which it rests, and what lengths its beneficiaries will go to in order to keep their noses in the trough and the rest of us in thrall to their warped, God-free religious fantasy of Equality.

POWER

First point: This is a society run by lawyers, for lawyers. Leftist 'human rights' lawyers often have the power to block political initiatives which do not fit in with their own destructive agenda. At the same time, many of the injustices done to our people and to our movement by liberal-totalitarians in the police, courts and electoral system go unchallenged because we still lack the legal clout and personnel to deal with them effectively.

The BNP's Legal Department has had a number of stunning victories, but we've also missed some equally exciting opportunities because we haven't had the right specialist solicitor or combative barrister available at the right time.

Yet certain individual legal victories can be much more important in the long run than winning elections. Establishing and maintaining the right of BNP members to organise actively within trades unions, for example, is a battle which is likely to take literally years. But a glimpse at the history of a wide range of successful 'People Power' movements in recent decades shows the enormous value of the power to bring out sections of organised labour to oppose the undemocratic chicanery of those who refuse to accept the verdict of popular opinion.

While such a mass movement will take the devoted efforts of many thousands of grass-roots patriotic trade unionists, their right to organise in the first place is likely to be secured by a team of just half-a-dozen

articulate and fearless young nationalist lawyers. If you think you have the intellect and the courage to be part of that team, then get into the Law.

The second great area which gives the cadres of any movement seeking radical change an unusually large degree of influence and power is, of course, the mass media.

In point of fact, the excessive influence of this, the "Fourth Estate", is one of the key problems which a future nationalist government will have to address in order to turn the present media-skewed elective dictatorship into a genuine democracy. But in order to institute such badly needed reforms we have to get to power in the first place so, until then, it behoves us to do our best to take advantage of the flaws in the present system.

At this point, the more paranoid of the 'Old Guard', and those who have grown up taking too much notice of the whacky conspiracy theories that abound on the Internet, will shake their heads in disbelief. "All the papers and broadcasting media are owned and controlled by the Jews/Masons/Communists/International Banks/Catholic Church/Homosexual Lobby (delete as applicable) and no genuine nationalist would ever be allowed to get beyond being the office cleaner," is the thoroughly defeatist, and inaccurate, assessment which springs from such over-simplified generalisations.

Of course, it is indeed true that certain minority groups do punch far above their weight when it comes to influence within the media, whether as

owners, editors or journalists. But this uncomfortable fact (which liberal propagandists still berate me for pointing out in my now out-of-print survey *The Mind-Benders*) does not justify the blanket paranoia of the defeatist bigots who excuse their own failure to build a movement to which large numbers of ordinary people can relate by exaggerating the power of 'The Enemy'.

So here's the real position with regards to the mass media: It is very much like any other capitalist industry. True, its owners often make use of the power it gives them to influence political debate and electoral outcomes, but their primary aim is to make money.

To make money they have to sell papers or win and retain a large audience. This makes it very difficult for them to position the editorial policy of their publicity machine at any significant distance from the average mind-set of their audience. This fact explains why the BBC - which has historically been uniquely free of this constraint on account of getting its income from a state-enforced monopoly licence fee - is so much more devoted to the multi-culti 'dream' than, for example, the *Daily Mail* and *The Sun*.

The bosses of the mass media also have to recruit good quality staff, and to give them a fair degree of independence in terms of choosing what subjects they cover and how they cover them. Anything else, such as direct 1984-style Minitru censorship, would simply be too cumbersome and slow. Any newspaper or broadcast





channel trying to operate in that way would end up producing such old and stale news that it would rapidly lose out to its more flexible competitors.

How then, in the absence of such censorship apparatus, do so many media outlets come up with so many similar PC stories? Why did every national newspaper cover up, just to give one example, the torturing to death of 15-year-old Kriss Donald in Glasgow last year; the most brutal racist murder in British history?

Because the editors, sub-editors, and the lead reporters are overwhelmingly part of the generation that became politically aware while every public school common room had that poster of Che Guevara on the wall, when *If* and then *The Wall* were cult films, and when the Marxist/Fenian/self-hating freak John Lennon was simpering on about the joys of a world with "nothing to live or die for."

Those formative views have since been moulded by events such as the Fall of the Berlin Wall, seeing *Schindler's List*, their acquisition of large salaries, and holidays in the bourgeois Europhile pilgrimage spots of Tuscany and the Dordogne.

When the men and women raised on such a diet of pure poison all ask the same absurd questions of BNP

spokesmen, all worship the cult of St. Stephen the Martyr of Eltham, and all sneer at "xenophobic nationalism", it's nothing to do with any mythical 'Conspiracy,' it's because they are intellectual and emotional clones. No-one has to tell them to think the same thoughts; they do so automatically.

NOT ALL ARE BRAIN DEAD

But there is no static law of nature or politics that insists that only brain-dead liberal-left bigots can be journalists. For one thing, not a few of them have shown they are not brain-dead by demonstrating their ability to abandon at least some of their old shibboleths.

The classic example of this is Peter Hitchens, the one-time Marxist who, for all the ignorant and juvenile abuse he throws at the BNP, now writes truly great assaults on the liberal-left such as *The Abolition of Britain* and *A Brief History of Crime*. When he finally gets around to accepting the growing weight of scientific and medical research evidence demolishing the old myth that "we are all the same under the skin", Peter will have completed his long and painful rehab from his youthful addiction to the opiate of Marxism.

Rod Liddle is another high-profile

case. Briefly a member of the Socialist Workers Party, he has drifted from his Trotskyite youth through the PC upper echelons of the BBC. Today he has reached the point when even the editor of the reasonably free-thinking and right-wing *Spectator* has to preface Rod's articles about the clash between free speech and Islam with headlines that make the necessary ritual condemnation of the BNP.

Interviewing me for a forthcoming TV programme on some of the problems caused by mass immigration, Liddle made the fascinating admission that he has only recently understood - and won - his battle against the subconscious self-censorship that used to colour his own writings whenever he had occasion to mention the British National Party.

Even more heartening for the future is that the likes of Hitchens and Liddle have not only radically changed their opinions, but are still allowed to express them in the mainstream media. Better still, all the signs are that this is only the start of the trend. As Damien Thompson, also writing in *The Spectator*, said just last week:

"The notion that the essential function of multiculturalism is to assuage the guilt of a white elite certainly makes sense; the interesting question is whether the ideology can survive the evidence of its practical failure and the growing mockery of its supposed beneficiaries. I suspect that it might not: the anti-racist functionaries are beginning to grow pale and weary like the gods in *Das Rheingeld*, deprived of their youth and dimly aware that a world order is collapsing about them."

The steady weakening of what not so long ago appeared to be a PC death-grip on the media was also highlighted by the experience of one of our London multi-media activists on a Mayor Livingstone-funded video course. He and his twenty or so left-wing fellow students had a seminar with a senior figure from a major British TV channel.

In the discussions at the end of this, our man made it clear that he regarded the broadcasting world as full of left-liberal narrow-mindedness and regime propaganda. Imagine his surprise, therefore, when the TV executive in question made a special point of approaching him - and him alone - afterwards, and virtually begging him





IRONIC: NUJ members campaigning for freedom of speech



to reconsider his rejection of a career in TV. "You'd be amazed by how many of us at the top of the industry are sick of Political Correctness, but the trouble is that we can only show programmes that people will make, and so many of the production companies are run by left-wingers that that's all we can find to broadcast."

That is why, despite the silly National Union of Journalists Code of Conduct, which supposedly compels all journalists to attack the BNP at every possible opportunity, there are tremendously important career openings for bright young nationalists in all the varied fields in the mass media.

Newspaper journalism, video shooting and editing - the choice is wide. Yet any one of those choices will within a relatively few years give today's school-leavers the chance to begin to influence not only the public but also the views of other young journalists around them.

After all, they too will have been to colleges where they couldn't walk home after a night out without experiencing firsthand some of the wonders of the multi-racial experiment, and they too will come to resent the fact that certain 'minority' colleagues get promoted solely on account of what they are rather than what they can do.

In addition, for those who get so far but then simply cannot stomach working under ageing 1960s leftists who still won't admit that their 'dream' has turned into a nightmare, there will

always be a limited number of openings working directly within the nationalist movement for capable journalists and video technicians for whom principle is more important than a decent salary.

JOIN A UNION

For the less academic, the best advice is probably not to fall for the Blairite con of going to a polytechnic-turned-university in order to incur a massive debt in exchange for a 'degree' in Sociology. It's almost certainly going to be better to get a job in an industry large enough to be unionised, join the union, keep your political head down for a couple of years, and get yourself on every union training course you can grab.

The legal battle over union membership referred to earlier will either be resolved in such a way that you will in due course be able to use this experience to become a really effective organiser within a union which we will be seeking to wrest itself from its present Marxist leadership, or by our creating one big nationalist trade union of our own - in which case proper union training is also going to be essential.

The alternative, better if you are determined to have a high political profile right from the start, is to get the training and experience you need to become self-employed in a trade paying decent money and which brings you into contact with people. Plumbing, carpentry, electrical work,

plastering - all such honest trades fit the bill, and hard work only ever did anyone good. Do take a long, hard look, however, for any signs that your first choice might be becoming vulnerable to significant numbers of scab labour East Europeans coming in to drive down wages.

If neither the academic nor manual trades routes appeal to you, or if you have already made your choice and plumped for something else, don't despair. The final category of nationalists who find ways to turn their employment to the benefit of the Cause can work in almost any field you can think of: Whistleblowers!

Council office staff, nurses, policemen, building labourers, social workers, soldiers, teachers, all these and many others have been able, in recent months alone, to pass useful information about an assortment of PC scandals to BNP councillors, to *Freedomor* to our website.

And, of course, BNP members in almost every occupation imaginable (there are some exceptions whose value as long-term 'deep' moles is so great that nothing must be allowed to prejudice their positions) are also to help the Cause in one other very important way: Being good at their job, earning the respect of their fellow workers, and telling them why they support the British National Party. For such personal testimonials, more than anything else, are the things which win us new voters and new members.

So while this article has identified a limited number of particularly valuable career paths for young nationalists to follow, there is not a single person reading this who cannot do something to turn their job into something which helps to push the British National Party that little bit further forward.

Politics isn't something to be kept in a box and pulled out once or twice a week when you go paper-selling, canvassing or leafleting. Whatever you do to earn your crust, keep your family and earn the respect of your neighbours and workmates, your real choice - the only one, apart from having children, that is really going to count for something worthwhile in the long run - is to do the best you can to be a player, rather than a spectator, in the long march of sacrifice, persecution and intelligently applied dedication which is the only thing that can save all that we hold dear.




» Alan Goodacre defines his personal concept of

The Ten Axioms of Economic Nationalism

March 2005

The Economy



» Anyone who is not a hopeless globalist understands that no sane nation simply accepts the economic lot dealt to it by the forces of international capitalism, but seeks to play the world economic game to its own advantage. Of course, there is serious doubt that Britons today are living in a sane nation, so it is necessary to review the basic principles according to which we ought to play this game. Both major parties have now abandoned these principles; only the British National Party still espouses all of them. Much of what is below sounds obvious once stated, but as Orwell once wrote, remaining aware of the obvious requires constant effort. To wit:

Axiom #1: *The fundamental goal of economic policy-making must be the material well-being of the British people.*

This sounds obvious, but recent governments have not believed this. The Tories have simply surrendered to an international free market that doesn't care a whit about British interests over those of Guandong, and Tony Blair is primarily interested in preparing Britain's economy to be soldered into a European superstate.

The British National Party will put Britain first, not the global free market and not the EU.

Axiom #2: *The material well-being of the British people is similar to, but not identical with, Britain's economic well-being.*

Not all aspects of material well-being are part of the economy. For example, a home-cooked meal may be superior to one eaten out, because it strengthens family ties, but the economic statistics only consider the labour of preparing a McDonalds' meal to be "output." As a result, a nation of broken families and McDonalds' eaters will seem to be more prosperous even if it is not, simply because domestic work has been converted to paid labour. The same is true of a child cared for at a day-care centre rather than at home.

There are other examples of how the fetish for GDP misrepresents our material well-being. The fact that

environmental degradation doesn't show up in the figures is one. Another is the fact that a safe neighbourhood that needs no private security guards shows a lower level of economic output than a dangerous neighbourhood where every business has to hire them. Hordes of lawyers settling disputes are another, as are expensive public schools doing what inexpensive state schools used to do.

The BNP will not, unlike the current economic establishment, confuse economic output with material well-being.

Axiom #3: *The economic well-being of Britain is (more-or-less) a function of per-capita GDP, not aggregate GDP.*

This little point refutes a huge amount of sophistry that is currently being promoted, principally with regard to immigration. The establishment keeps yapping about how immigration is supposedly good for the economy and seems to have the figures to back it up. But all this means is that immigration increases Britain's aggregate GDP, a natural consequence of increasing the number of persons working here. It does not mean that immigration increases per-capita GDP. In fact, because immigrants tend to be cheap labourers who are less productive than the average Briton, immigration decreases per-capita GDP. Furthermore, because productivity is a function of capital-per-worker, immigration dilutes productivity by increasing the number of workers dependent on the given capital stock and encouraging the use of cheap labour over labour-saving technology.

The BNP will aim at per-capita growth and not try to expand our economy by dumping foreign labour into it.

Axiom #4: *The economic well-being of Britain is more precisely a function of the income of the average British family, not of total national income.*

It is no secret that since Thatcher, economic growth in this country has tended to flow to the top of the income scale. While this does increase per-capita income, it means that the beneficiaries of this income do not include a large portion of this country. Britain has a higher level of

economic inequality than most other European countries, and this is inexcusable.

Of course, it is no secret that the old-style socialist methods of redistributing income down the scale turned out to have harmful effects, so unfortunately it is not just a matter of taxing income away from the rich and towards the working class. But there are other policy tools that can be used to reduce income inequality, like encouraging advanced manufacturing "hard" industries that employ many skilled and well-paid ordinary workers, as opposed to service "soft" industries where everyone is either an investment banker or a delivery boy.

The BNP will use non-destructive means, like a "hard industries" policy, to reduce income inequality.

Axiom #5: *The economic well-being of Britain is more precisely a function of the real income of the average British family.*

Real income means, of course, adjusted for inflation, which properly understood must include inflation in house prices, not just the Consumer Price Index of ordinary goods. House prices in Britain, particularly in the south of England, have been allowed to skyrocket in recent years to the point where many ordinary people who don't own houses cannot afford to acquire them and those who pay rent must spend an excessive portion of their income. Can this possibly have something to do with the fact that at least 300,000 foreigners have moved into the south of England since 1990? Of course it can.

The BNP will fight immigration-driven rises in the cost of living, and will put housing costs into the Consumer Price Index.

Axiom #6: *It's the long term, not the short, that counts.*

Unlike the major parties, the BNP wants Britain to still be here for our children and grandchildren. Economic "quick fixes" abound, but they all exact a price in the long run. For example: Unions that extract wage increases their employers can't afford just produce corporate bankruptcies and redundancies later; Governments that spend borrowed money just saddle future taxpayers with the need to pay interest on it, laissez-faire energy policies that will leave us dependent on unstable foreign powers for oil that will run out one day.

The British National Party will not pursue quick fixes but long-term solutions.

Axiom #7: *Wages are set by the supply and demand for labour, so immigration drives down wages by increasing supply.*

Establishment economists have this odd quirk: they teach all day that the price of any given commodity is determined by its supply and demand, and then they conveniently forget this when it comes to labour. Why? Because the establishment wants labour to be as cheap as possible. Yet it is in the interest of the average British worker to minimise the supply and maximise the demand for his labour.

The BNP will end immigration and encourage the orderly and humane voluntarily resettlement of existing foreign workers and their descendants.

Axiom #8: *Sustainable income is a product of effective*

investment in British industry

What makes Britain a First World country, rather than a Third World one, is the fact that British workers have hundreds of years of accumulated capital equipment to work with. This means the long-term prosperity of this country is a matter of having the highest possible level of capitalisation. Unless the capital flows in from abroad, which just means that the profits must flow out again, the capitalisation of British industry is a function of how much money Britons save. Furthermore, a high savings rate is a good thing because it helps provide for people in their retirement.

The British National Party will support efforts to raise the national savings rate and encourage such savings to be invested in building up British industry, not chasing quick profits overseas.

Axiom #9: *Owners should work, and workers should own.*

If ordinary Britons increase their savings rate and invest the money in British industry, it will eventually come about over time that they are the owners of British industry. This has been called "pension-fund socialism," and it combines the efficiency of capitalist private ownership with socialism's ideal of worker ownership of the means of production. It also gives workers an incentive to care about the long-term health of the companies they work for, as they are part owners. It is also a nationalist policy, as it tends to bring the ownership of British industry into British hands.

The BNP supports the gradual assumption of worker ownership through their pension funds.

Axiom #10: *Foreign trade is an opportunity, not an obligation.*

We are told by the three old parties that free trade, i.e. without tariffs or other restrictions, is best. But this amounts to saying that all foreign trade, whatever its drawbacks, must be accepted simply as a matter of abstract principle. But common sense says that some trade is good for us, some is bad, and we must reserve the right to choose, just as all advanced nations regulate other aspects of economic life. Most other nations understand this in practice, whatever they say in public.

The BNP opposes free trade. We are not against all foreign trade, but would stop that which destroys good jobs, depletes our industrial base, causes trade deficits, or threatens our sovereignty.





March 2005

Media Distortions



Racist Crime in London

» Lee Barnes looks at the latest distortions from the *London Evening Standard* 'fear and smear' machine

» In the *Evening Standard* of November 23rd last a report on racism was published that stated that racist crime was on the rise in London.

We are constantly told we live in a 'Multicultural Utopia' and billions of pounds are spent by the government every year on brainwashing people to reject even the very notion of 'race' as a scientific fact in schools, science and society, yet the number of 'racist' crimes seems to rise relentlessly year in and year out, regardless of the assertion that 'race' does not exist.

Without the existence of the various 'races' of mankind present in our communities and the visible differences of the races, how then can 'racism' itself exist? This is the logical absurdity that sits uneasily in the snarl of lies that is the liberal mind set.

This is the intellectual hollow that the entire foundation of the debate on racism is built upon. By even acknowledging the existence of races you become a racist, for racist depends entirely on the existence of races. It makes no sense at all, and nor is it designed to, for the entire debate on racism is undertaken following the rules of the old-style Marxist-Leninist 'Terrorism of the Word' where real debate must never occur in public but one's enemies must be abused, vilified

and attacked in pure emotional and emotive language to avoid rational debate. It is the politics of the playground bully.

Every year the rise in so called 'racism' continues across the entire country - but it is not due to 'racism'. It is primarily due to members of the ethnic minorities being encouraged by the Government and the police to adopt the false consciousness of perpetual 'racism' being omnipresent at all times in their lives and then perceiving that this 'racism' permeates all the everyday transactions and interactions of ordinary life around them. The 'Anti-Racism Industry' and the race careerists who profit from exploiting 'racism', are the pimps of political correctness prostituting the truth and social stability for personal profit.

RACE RELATIONS INDUSTRY

They have made 'race' and 'racism' at the centre of a vast new State Industry. Just like the old style Soviet Union centrally planned industries, the 'Race Relations Industry' is a vast, sprawling monolithic state monopoly subsidised by the government, with its own laws, police and revolutionary language. But just as the Five Year plans of Stalin and Lenin failed to solve the problems of

Russia, the race relations careerists cannot solve the problem of simple human nature.

When they failed in Russia the Communists began to kill their opponents. In Holland the anti-racists killed Pim Fortuyn, they banned the *Vlaams Blok* in Belgium and in Britain they have tried to remove the basic human and political rights of the BNP and its members for not succumbing to their lies and threats.

Terrorism in the name of morality is the credo of the liberal fascists and today in Britain we in the BNP are the primary victims of 'tolerance'. It seems that even though there are no such things as 'races' there are 'racists' hiding under every stone across our entire country. This is just another example of the 'politics of fear' currently being used to destroy our democratic rights by New Labour Stalinism.

The definition of a racist crime as used by the police and the media is meaningless, it is nothing more than an arbitrary definition adopted to promote a covert political agenda specifically designed to exclude the indigenous white communities of Britain. If every white person was encouraged by the government and the police to report every crime

committed against them by an ethnic minority as 'racist' (and the police were allowed to classify such a crime as 'racist') then the recorded numbers of white victims of 'race attacks' would change dramatically.

DOUBLE STANDARDS

The incentive to ethnics to report every crime as racist is increased as such crimes are prioritised by the police, have more police resources spent on them and also mean that the 'victims' get more compensation. These are great incentives to report every crime, however trivial, as racist. This double standard of the police, that crimes against ethnic minorities are somehow more important than those against whites, is itself a vicious and unlawful form of police racism against the indigenous people of this country.

Combine this with gutless politically correct policing that allows ethnic minorities to escape police attention for fear of causing them offence, thereby allowing criminality in their communities to go unchecked, and the white community in Britain suffers a double hammer blow of racist oppression by the British state and police. It is an incontrovertible fact that the police and Government are racist against whites. Whilst Rastafarians can smoke cannabis in the streets for cultural reasons in Brixton and not get arrested, whites with multiple sclerosis in Brighton could go to jail for smoking it in their own homes for legitimate medical reasons.

The article in the *Evening Standard* stated that unemployment in ethnic minority communities is higher than in the indigenous population. Well perhaps many of these people should learn to speak English and then they would be able to enter a competitive jobs market and compete for jobs on an equal basis.

If it is 'racist' to demand that employees on a building site can read safety signs, learn to use the safety equipment and have training in emergency first aid, then that is a form of 'racism' we would encourage. The fact that deaths are reaching record levels on building sites and immigrant labour is swamping the sites may suggest a linkage between these two facts.

Recently a McDonalds' restaurant was even threatened with being taken

to an Industrial Tribunal for 'racism' when it said its ethnic minority staff should speak English when serving customers or doing their jobs on the shop floor.


So far I have thankfully managed to avoid having to learn how to order "one Big Mac with french fries and a white coffee" in Urdu or Korean and frankly I do not see why I should do so unless I am visiting a McDonalds in India or Korea. The fact that various ethnic cultures encourage their women to stay at home and encourage their members to stay within their own communities and not learn English may also impact on their suitability for a job say as an ambulance paramedic, plumber or TV repair man. Blaming racism for everything is not just a lie, it is pathetic.

A few weeks ago in the *Times Law Section* a smug South African journalist wrote that whilst a third of Pakistani households in Britain live in poverty, only 6 % of indigenous white families do. This, she said, was evidence of racism against Pakistani families. Actually it was evidence of her utter stupidity. Pakistani Muslims

have a population of around half a million people living in Britain. This means approximately 165,000 Pakistanis live in poor households. Let's say that 61 million people live in Britain and of those ten percent are from ethnic minorities. This means that roughly 54 million are white. This means of the 54 million white people living in Britain nearly 3.5 million (or 6%) of white families are living in poverty in Britain, but unlike the numbers of Pakistani families living in poverty this is not a national scandal nor is it racist. The use of figures and numbers by the media and politicians to depict racist trends is nothing more than pure lies or a crass deception. If poverty is evidence of racism by the British government then poor white families are the largest victims of racist crimes in Britain.

'RACIST' TEACHERS

The report in the *Evening Standard* then mentioned the rise in school exclusions amongst ethnic minority children. Once again 'white racist' teachers are being blamed for overtly





being 'racists' for daring to demand that their schools exclude children from ethnic minorities when they are attacked by them in their classrooms. Tolerance now should extend to violence against teachers it seems. Yet the NUT does not rush to the defence of teachers and state that it is not racist to seek exclusions for thugs of any colour or race, but instead allows to remain unchallenged the accusation that exclusion of ethnic minorities from schools is based on racism. More cowardice and stupidity from the gutless Marxist morons who run the trades unions in Britain.

The *Evening Standard* then stated in evidence of this 'epidemic' of racism that Industrial Tribunal race cases have risen by nearly 100% in the last few years, but this is not due to 'racism' but is due to four main reasons, these being;

1) The burden of proof is reversed in race cases involving ethnic minorities, thereby making it easier for the accuser to win the case by making the accused prove a negative - which in law is always a difficult thing to do. Racism in industrial tribunal cases, if alleged by the accuser, is accepted as an objective fact rather than a

subjective assertion even without any evidence to sustain that contention and thereby even if you have not committed any act of racism you still have to prove that you have not done so.

2) The Commission for Racial Equality will fund all and any 'race cases' for ethnic minorities that apply whilst legal aid is not available for whites in Industrial Tribunal cases. This is racism of the most vile kind - why should white people be denied legal aid whilst ethnic minorities get it as of right? The CRE is the primary racist organisation in Britain today, along with the London Assembly run by the ex-communist crank and apologist for IRA and Islamic terror, Ken Livingstone.

3) More compensation is available in race cases for the claimant, so that motivates them to try their luck in such cases.

4) Most businesses will tend to settle race cases before they get to the tribunal so as to avoid an expensive and damaging case that is difficult to win.

The final disgusting part of the *Evening Standard* article was to suggest that because the BNP has won councillors in parts of London this has caused 'race crimes' to increase. This is once again a crass deceit. The number of race attacks against whites has increased vastly across the country and the majority of new race attacks registered as race crimes across the country are against white people. Whites are the primary victims of all race attacks in Britain.

A British National Party councillor elected in any area allows white people to have the confidence to report racist crimes against them to the anti-white racist police force that are doing New Labour's racist bidding. Most people see the decent copper on the beat being stabbed in the back by the politically correct cabal of Chief Police Officers/Social Workers put into their jobs by corrupt politicians. Most people see policing in this country as 'street politics' not nicking criminals any more. They fear the police, they do not respect them any more.

THE BURNLEY SYNDROME

In Burnley, where the BNP have six councillors, the number of racist crimes has actually decreased in that area, whilst everywhere else in the country - where endless 'anti-racist crime strategies' and more pathetic 'politically correct policing' and vast amounts of tax payers' money has been thrown at the problem of 'racist crime' - the numbers of race crimes have actually risen.

It seems from the statistics that we have seen that the effect of a single BNP councillor elected in a council ward allows the disenfranchised white community to feel confident about reporting racist crimes against them to the police (which then increases the overall race crime figures as a whole), whilst a large BNP presence on local councils forces ethnic minority racists to curb their racist attacks on white people in those communities (which causes race crimes figures to then fall as a whole).

But this information would conflict with the lies the media tell you - so of course you won't ever read it in the papers.

Welcome to the debate on 'race' in today's Britain - fit only for lemmings and morons.

"In Burnley, where the BNP have six councillors, the number of racist crimes have actually decreased in that area"



Health Service Briefing

» In this latest report from Britain's Health Service, Dr Alan Cornwall says that the British National Party is the only hope for our NHS and the country

» The Government's recent proposals to 'reform' the NHS pension scheme are yet another kick in the teeth for Britain's hard-pressed health workers. The current scheme, to which hundreds of thousands of NHS workers belong, enables staff to retire at sixty with their pension being calculated as a percentage of their final salary. Government proposals change this to retirement at sixty five and the pension being based upon an average of the person's earnings whilst in the NHS.

Take for example a nurse who has steadily been promoted throughout her career and who finishes as a hospital manager on £40,000 a year. Under the current scheme that person would retire at sixty with a pension based on a percentage of that £40,000. Under the new scheme retirement would be delayed for 5 years and the pension based on a percentage on her average pay throughout her career - obviously less than £40,000. Particularly hard hit would be individuals who had many years on low pay, perhaps whilst training.

All of this 'reform' is designed to cut the pension entitlement of NHS workers (and indeed of all public service workers) to save money. One group of 'public servants'(!) not planning to include themselves in these new arrangements are our elected representatives. Such hypocrisy and double dealing would appear to have become the norm in British public life.

CANCER WASTE

'Reform' is an organisation, with nearly 1,000 doctors as members, that comments upon current care in the NHS. Its recent report into Britain's cancer services is devastating. The report indicates that millions of pounds of investment have been wasted in bureaucracy and muddle.

Whilst the Government claims to have made waiting lists, a priority the report shows that a study in Glasgow revealed that 20% of lung cancer patients became unsuitable for treatment during their wait for radiotherapy. Effectively, they waited so long that by the time they came to the front of the queue it was too late. Some patients are left for 16-17 weeks awaiting treatment.

This malaise is typical of the NHS under Tony Blair. The NHS needs administrators and managers. Good management contributes to patient care and makes good



use of resources. Under this Government, and the Tory governments before, layer upon layer of needless bureaucracy has been added to accommodate endless organisational change. Dividing our NHS services up into separate Trusts has inevitably meant an explosion of managers.

In my own service, for example, a patient being moved from a psychiatric bed to a general hospital bed (in the same hospital) is effectively moving from one NHS Trust to another. That means that when they arrive on their new ward they have to be discharged from one Trust and admitted to the other all of which requires about an hour of form filling. Plus, of course, entries on computer systems that cannot talk to each other. This leads to confusion, muddle and waste. When patients are ready to leave hospital they may be passed to social services - that's another set of forms, another computer system and another set of managers. None of this is necessary or needed. Inevitably it wastes resources that should be spent on patient care. Tackling these issues, and returning to a true National Health Service, must be a priority for an incoming BNP government.

ELECTION

We are all aware that the election is approaching. The last year has been a tempestuous one for the BNP. More councillors than we have ever had, police raids, arrests etc. Make no mistake that the old parties are seriously worried. They will use all the tricks they can to attack us. These sort of tactics are a sign of weakness rather than strength.

They recognise the potential for a British National Party breakthrough, especially with UKIP disintegrating. The NHS will be a key issue in the election. Now is the time for us to show that we are not just a one issue party. Thousands of NHS workers are looking for a lead in saving this great service from further decline. In my own area I am but one of many National Health Service. BNP members. The BNP is the only hope for our NHS and our country.





» Arthur Kemp reports on another BNP success

Police Warn: New Labour "creates racial tension and violence"



» The police have formally warned the Labour government that its asylum policy is "creating racial tension and violence" and, acting upon this warning, the Home Office has with immediate effect stopped dispersing asylum seekers in towns throughout Britain.

This about-turn on asylum seekers is a great victory for the British National Party, and the BNP's success in Burnley has been specially noted as a reason why New Labour's policy has been dismissed.⁽¹⁾

Burnley has been taken off the list of asylum seekers' destination towns since December 2002, the government has revealed.⁽²⁾

According to media reports, the Government has been forced to stop sending asylum seekers to cities and towns across Britain after being specifically warned by the police that its policy is "creating racial tension and violence."⁽³⁾

Formally listed as places where the asylum flood has been halted are Derby, Burnley and Nelson in Lancashire, Bootle on Merseyside, and large parts of Manchester, Nottingham and Doncaster.

The South Yorkshire police formally requested that no more asylum seekers be sent to that town after gangs of Middle Eastern men were involved in several violent attacks. According to a media report, a Home Office spokesman freely admitted that the suspension of asylum dispersion was "because of racial conflict."⁽⁴⁾

Chief Supt Jerry Graham, of Lancashire police, was

quoted as saying that the suspensions meant that his whole county was "effectively off-limits for new asylum seekers."⁽⁵⁾

SPIN FIGURES MEAN NOTHING

Instead of being ashamed at the outright failure of its asylum policy, New Labour has in fact tried to claim success: in August it released figures which allegedly showed a decline of 13 percent in the numbers of asylum seekers.

The reality is that in practice the New Labour spin figures mean almost nothing. What they fail to add is that, simultaneous with this alleged fall, Third World immigration has reached a record high: the number of what are officially described as "non-Europeans" allowed to settle permanently in Britain rose by 20 percent in 2003 to record levels and is now more than twice the total of 20 years ago.⁽⁶⁾

According to official figures, almost 140,000 "non-Europeans" were granted settlement, 20 per cent more than in 2002, compared with about 60,000 in 1997 and around 55,000 in 1983.⁽⁷⁾

Fifty percent of those settling were given permission for reasons of "family formation and reunion" - in other words because they already had family present in the UK; and 21 per cent of settlements were "employment related". The total arising from asylum applications was about 15 per cent.⁽⁸⁾

The official figures show that in the past five years, more than 540,000 people have been granted leave to settle in Britain, a substantial rise on the total for the previous five years. This is of course only the formal legal number: the true number of illegal immigrants is, as widely admitted, far higher than that.

Official Home Office figures show, for example, that 1.5 million entrance visas into the UK are issued every year⁽⁹⁾ - yet there is absolutely no checking procedure as to who leaves again!

"This one's trained to sniff out nymphomaniacs, not drugs or asylum seekers."



It is astounding that there are no embarkation checks on who leaves the UK once they have entered: in contrast to almost ALL other countries, which ensure that the people who are granted entry visas are in fact checked out again, with an embarkation card system.

Unsurprisingly, the result of this chaos is that when he was Home Secretary even David Blunkett admitted publicly that "he hasn't a clue" who is in Britain.

The reality is that:

- ☐ Immigration has doubled since 1997;
- ☐ Work permits are up 400 per cent;
- ☐ Asylum applications are up 60 per cent from 1997;
- ☐ Only one in five failed asylum applicants is sent Home.

Britain has lost control of her borders, and the situation has been reached where even the politically correct police forces are being driven to publicly reprimand New Labour for this insanity.

The only good news amongst all of this is the fact that the increasing number of people voting BNP has played a major role in reversing at least one part of New Labour's plans to destroy the British people. The time has come for a renewed push to finish off the criminal gang of Labour/Tories/Lib Dems who have spent the last 5 decades working assiduously to destroy the very nature and character of Britain.

Sources

(1 - 5) **Racial tensions halt dispersal of asylum seekers around UK**, *The Telegraph*, Daniel Foggo and

Tony Freinberg, 14/11/2004,

(6 - 8) **Immigration at record high as asylum level falls**, *The Telegraph*, John Steele, Home Affairs

Correspondent, 25/08/2004,

(9) **MigrationWatch UK**,

<http://www.migrationwatchuk.org/frameset.asp?menu=faqs&page=faqs.asp>

Abortion and Rape

» *Sadie Graham comments on some of the issues raised by Diane Stoker in her article on abortion in our February issue, particularly in relation to pregnancies resulting from rape. It is felt that a combination of the two articles pretty much sums up the Nationalist overall viewpoint on abortion - Editor*

» The author of the article on abortion published in the February issue gives strong opinions of an anti-abortionist stance. However, the article is highly controversial when mentioning pregnancy as a result of rape.

The British National Party is not pro-abortion, but it would certainly support any woman's decision were she the victim of such an awful act as rape. My own feeling is that the BNP should not oppose abortion so much on moral, pro-life grounds, but on account of cultural and political reasons.

Abortion is linked to issues concerning the decline of family values in society and cultural reasons of an increasingly low white birth-rate, high non-white birth-rate and politically motivated pressures on British women to focus on their careers rather than raise families.

PERSONAL OPINIONS

It should be made clear that the Diane was voicing her own opinion and not necessarily those of other BNP members. Many of our female supporters and voters who read Identity may have different views, and opposing abortion even in cases of rape would be a sure-fire way to lose their support.

The British National Party has an obligation to allow open debate on important political issues. However abortion is a very controversial and highly personal issue. A subject that is often highly dictated by personal experience. The article would have been better written were it from a cultural and political perspective of abortion, rather than one based upon emotive generalisations. To sum up the British National Party is opposed to abortion, but not under every circumstance.



HALIFAX FREE SPEECH DEMONSTRATION

The bail date set for Nick Griffin, Mark Collett and Tom Lindon has been moved from March 2nd to April 6th at Halifax police station.

Hundred's of BNP members and supporters wishing to support Mark, Tom and Nick will be meeting at Halifax police station between 11.15am and 11.30am. Please bring flags and banners!



The 100 Seat Campaign

» Eddy Butler, the BNP's National Elections Officer, explains what we are trying to achieve

» The forthcoming General Election is looming large in the minds of political commentators and activists of all parties, not least those in the BNP. However, it is essential that we get it clear in our minds what we are trying to achieve by contesting the General Election. It is clear that there is some misunderstanding of our intentions and realistic ambitions, and this misunderstanding must be addressed.

In a way this is not surprising (even though this matter was discussed by the Party Chairman in the October issue of *Identity*.) Our strategy is more complex, one might be tempted to puff out our chest and say more sophisticated, than is usually the case when nationalist parties have contested previous General Elections. It requires a little more thought and as such is more demanding of our activists and donors.

In the past a target number of seats was set, and the party met that target with every region standing in as many seats as it could muster. Each region or branch was left pretty much to stand in the seat it desired, with a minimal amount of guidance from Head Office.

Contesting General Elections has variously been presented as: a recruitment exercise (by means of election addresses and TV broadcasts); an opportunity to gain local publicity and campaigning experience to help build a local unit; enhancing internal cohesion by the whole party engaging in a nationwide effort; to show people that we are still here by 'putting down a marker' - no doubt you and I could think of more in a similar vein.

These are (or were) all valid reasons for contesting the General Election. However, it must be realised



that the party has moved on in its development. This advance is not just in simple terms of the number of members, the number of branches or even the number of elected councillors. Crucially, for our long term success the party has advanced considerably in terms of the refinement of its approach to its strategic development. The party is no longer in the position of being an impotent player in the political battlefield. We are not just a cork to be tossed around on the sea, pitching into events over which we have no control. We can to a large extent determine our own direction.

TANTALISING

However, involving ourselves in national elections that are predominantly dictated by the mass media takes away our freedom of action. This lesson was again amply demonstrated by last year's European elections. In that instance it was a risk worth taking as the potential prize was so great. We were only prevented from attaining that prize (and even then by a tantalisingly narrow margin) by an unprecedented combination of 'strokes' pulled by our multi-headed opponents, ranging from electoral gerrymandering (e.g. the widespread introduction of postal voting) to media

created safety-valves (the temporary Kilroy-UKIP nexus).

In the medium term our objective can be summarised as to sink widespread and deep local roots within our communities. Widespread in the sense that each unit must build solid support within target wards, that will soon after manifest itself as electoral victories in virtually every town and city across the country. We will create counter-cultural zones; we will enable our embattled communities to regain their pride, purpose and freedom.

By engaging with our local communities we create a sea in which to swim. We create solid support that will not evaporate when the media hype up another phoney alternative. Solid support that will not disappear when lies and smears are spread about us. Solid support that will return BNP councillors year after year and allow us to open up new target wards. In the longer term we will be in a position to break the media's death grip upon our electoral process, step up the rungs of the political ladder and contest the bigger elections, not with hope, but with the real expectation of victory.

As if to confirm this, the Tories have announced that opposition to uncontrolled immigration will be a central plank of their 2005 election manifesto. Furthermore, our old friend

Kilroy-Silk has been dusted off and brought out of the *Daily Express* cupboard to front a new 'right-wing' party, just in time to contest the General Election.

Now these establishment safety-valves may or may not work for them. There are many imponderables. It may backfire on them by serving to legitimise our position in the eyes of a large chunk of the electorate and actually boost our standing. Just as possibly, we could be frozen out. We can only influence events on the margin, perhaps by achieving certain successes or by engineering a number of counter coups.

So what are our objectives in the General Election and how will they further our longer term plans?

1. The first objective is to stand in over a hundred seats to confirm our position as a major player in the British political scene. This will be the largest number of seats the BNP has ever contested in a General Election and is comfortably within our ability. We could stand in a considerably larger number of seats, but any more would not add to the effect we need to create and would be a waste of resources.

As already stated our focus must be on local politics not national elections. A hundred seats are all that is required to achieve that end. That number coincidentally will also provide us with a Parliamentary TV broadcast. (I will call it 100 seat campaign even though we will probably stand in 110 to provide a margin of error).

2. There are certain areas of the

"Come here madam, I won't hurt you!"



country where a tradition of voting BNP is being established for a significant section of the electorate. These areas can primarily be found in West Yorkshire, parts of the North East, the Lancashire Mill Towns, the Black Country, North East and South East London, and South Essex. It would not be sensible to miss a major election as it would risk breaking that developing habit.

3. In meeting the 100 seat target, the overwhelming bulk of the seats are where we obtained over 8% in the Euro Election (most of these seats are concentrated in the areas mentioned above). We could in fact have selected somewhat more than a hundred seats on this one criterion, but as we only require 100 seats, and as there are other seats that we need to contest, not every area that meets this threshold will be contested. Because we are contesting, in the main, our 'best' seats, we should get a favourable average percentage vote, and hopefully a healthy number of saved deposits. A deposit to stand in a Parliamentary seat is £500, which is returned if a candidate obtains over 5% of the vote. Accordingly we will be forking out £55,000 in deposits alone. Clearly, the more we get back the better.

One word of warning. Percentages obtained in local government elections or in Euro Elections are always hard to maintain in General Elections. This is because the turnout is higher, the temptation to register a 'protest vote' is usually less pronounced and due to mass media coverage votes cast tend to become polarised between the two main parties. Now in this General Election we may well get a much lower than normal turn out, as it may well be a forgone conclusion that Labour will win. This may also lead people to register more protest votes. However on past trends we should expect smaller percentages than those obtained in the Euro Election.

Given that our vote in the Euro's was compressed by the Kilroy-UKIP factor, you could argue that 8% underestimates our support. Whatever the case, clearly these are the best seats and the best chances of saved deposits. Incidentally, all these 'what ifs' go to show that once you enter a contest such as the General Election you give up virtually all control

over your own result.

4. By concentrating our resources in certain 'target' constituencies we can realistically hope to get several good second places. We have never come second in a parliamentary seat, nor obtained over 20% of the vote. These are both realistic and worthwhile ambitions. To an extent, in these target constituencies we will be able to influence our result by our own efforts rather than be totally at the mercy of 'events'. The resources that must be concentrated are both financial and in terms of manpower.

Our activist teams must act regionally. This will provide the added benefit of training activists from less well-developed units within regions in the campaigning techniques that they need to learn and put into practice in their home town in our big push in 2006.

5. There is a different sort of target seat. We will also put up candidates against selected Tory MPs. The aim is to lose them their seats! Either by taking votes from them or by discouraging people from voting for them (via our election propaganda). I will not repeat the reasons for this as this strategy has been fully covered by Nick Griffin in the November issue of *Identity*.

6. We will also fight a small number of seats (that fail to meet the 8% threshold and are not targeted to oust an unsavoury sitting Tory MP) in order to provide a regional spread.

7. We will be producing most of our propaganda materials, such as election addresses, ourselves. In order to do this we will purchase brand new, state of the art high volume digi-duplicators, folding machines, industrial guillotines and so forth. Even with the cost of purchasing these capital assets we will be able to produce decent quality leaflets more cheaply than would be the case if we went to a commercial printer.

In the past, General Elections have caused considerable expense with nothing to show for it afterwards. No matter what the outcome, this time we will be left with assets that can be used for years afterwards. Importantly, this printing equipment, to which must be included the vital resource of trained



operators, will be extremely useful in furthering our overriding aim (sinking local roots), as after the election these machines will be used to produce even more local community newsletters.

8. As always in these big elections, we can also expect to harvest a healthy crop of new enquiries and members through our election addresses (which will go out in every constituency we fight) and the TV broadcasts and the website. It is a fact that during the General Election, people's 'political antennae' are more sensitively tuned and new recruits are more forthcoming.

Those units that do not have a constituency to fight must get stuck in helping their nearest target. They should also be working their local area in preparation for next year's local elections. The very fact that their area has not been selected implies that there is no widespread BNP voting tradition among their local electorate. Standing a candidate in their seat without having first established a rapport with their electorate would do nothing to add to that tradition. This has to be done by local work. We are not in the business of fighting seats everywhere and anywhere willy-nilly.

It is important that members re-tune their minds and do not get caught up in the widespread infatuation that General Elections are the only elections worth getting worked-up about. For us the local elections are the target. Units not fighting a seat must not get all disappointed and hurt. They must carry on with their areas and get stuck in to help their region and

help the Party's General Election effort by fund raising.

We have entered into this round of elections with a clearly defined and limited set of objectives. As I keep repeating, we must not hamstring ourselves from engaging in and developing our exciting programme of local community activities, and we must always be aware that involvement in the General Election is only of marginal utility in furthering these goals.

We must also develop BNPTv, a resource with massive future potential, in terms of propaganda, internal education and fund raising. BNPTv can also assist local campaigning by the production and distribution of local films. It is also important that we develop ideologically and organisationally this year, to harness the large number of new members we are absorbing into the Party. If we get totally infatuated in the General Election we will neglect these tasks. We must guard against 'mission creep', where we dream up new ideas, new schemes of marginal benefit to the election campaign which eat up creative energy, time and money. This can happen particularly at the centre of the Party, but also at the Branch level.

I haven't mentioned the prospect of winning a Parliamentary seat - unlikely without a major event, but we can up the ante if necessary. By concentrating our efforts on target seats, we are making victory in the event of some drastic occurrence more likely. Ours is a flexible and sensible approach. Of course our external propaganda will portray our campaign as striving for victory, but internally we must not ramp things up to unrealistic levels.

The most likely date for the General Election is May 5th and winning a seat on that day is possible. It is not defeatist to downplay chances of electoral victory at Parliamentary level; it is realistic and tactically sound. Our strategic and tactical decisions must be based on realistic assessments. If we only look at the General Election we could become distracted from the very real chance of winning a seat on May 5th. The reason why the General Election is likely to be held on May 5th is that is the pre-set date for the County Council elections and elections for a number of Mayoral seats in various cities. The last two General Elections have coincided with the County

Council elections. It is very important that we do all we can to ensure that we come out of May 5th with something to show for our efforts in terms of victories. We must focus on realistic prospects for victory and not let blood rush to our heads and mistakenly concentrate on unattainable targets.

Winning a County Council seat (a feat never before achieved by the BNP) is difficult amid the hullabaloo of a General Election. Yet it is feasible, as is the prospect of a Mayoral victory. Indeed a BNP Mayoral victory in Stoke would dominate the post election headlines, given that it is likely to be a forgone conclusion that Blair will obtain a third term with a safe majority. Accordingly, in terms of activist deployment, our target County Council and Mayoral seats must be given priority.

AMBITIONS

In the unlikely event of the General Election being held before May 5th, then we will have to trim down our ambitions. If after May 5th, then we must put even more effort into achieving a number of victories in the County Council and Mayoral elections. These could possibly act as a springboard for greater success and so could lead us to upgrade our efforts in a possible General Election held later in the year.

There are many important and worthwhile targets for us to meet with the General Election. Considerable funds have to be raised. Considerable efforts will have to be made by our committed activists, most of this effort must be focussed on our target seats.

The BNP has become a fixture in the British political scene and as such we are obliged to put up a good show in the General Election. We cannot be seen to have walked off the stage. However, the General Election must be seen as an interlude. An important interlude, but not the event of the year.

We must hit the ground running after it is over and press on with our vital objective of establishing deep local roots. We must not make the mistake of rushing headlong into a brick wall, just as the old NF did back in 1979 when they contested 303 seats. We must be patient and build from the bottom up. We will use the General Election for our own purposes, as a means to that end.

Control of Town Halls is our immediate target



Trade Imbalance: When Will The Banks Stop Funding it?

» *Ralph Ellis adds to the information given in the article by James Marsden on the economy and examines a hidden but growing danger.*

» There is another aspect of Labour fiscal policy that is receiving little attention: the trade imbalance. In the late eighties the Conservatives' (net) trade imbalance peaked at £22bn p.a. in today's money and this resulted in the economic crash of the early nineties.

Labour has not only reached the Conservatives' record (net) trade imbalance, it has doubled it (in today's terms), and it is this element, I believe, that will be their and Britain downfall. The trade imbalance can perhaps be regarded as hidden inflation, because when foreign banks finally stop funding our unearned and unjustifiable lifestyles the pound will crash and our imports (that is nearly everything we purchase today) will be much more expensive almost overnight. Imagine a 20% increase in prices in the space of a couple of months, which will greatly reduce demand in the shops and create a slump in the economy.

However, as interest rates rise to prevent the pound tumbling further, the vast borrowings that we have enjoyed over the recent years will come home to roost. Much more money will have to be spent on interest payments, which will reduce demand in the shops and further promote a slump. Cars, houses and other goods will be repossessed in vast numbers and poverty will begin to stalk our once prosperous lands. Even the government will have trouble repaying Gordon Brown's huge borrowings, and they will have to increase taxes further to compensate, which will likewise reduce demand in the shops and create an even bigger slump.

THE ROAD TO RUIN

So why is the government leading us down this road to ruin? Is it purely a short-term political device to ensure that Labour wins a third term? Certainly their foot-soldiers have bought the spin and propaganda hook, line and sinker. Mike Hall MP for instance, has written to me indicating that in the next parliament Labour will 'reap the rewards that come from having a continuing well run economy'.

In his rather simplistic view of the world, Mr Hall can see the long economic hill towards debt-fuelled prosperity that Labour has climbed over the last seven years, but cannot see the precipice lying under his feet - but judging by the woefully low calibre of the Labour MPs I have met, I am not greatly surprised. (Did anyone mention John two fists Prescott, or Gweneth Dunwelloutfit?)

But while the average Labour foot-soldier is intellectually challenged and easily led, can we really believe that Brown and Blair are equally stupid? The other possibility is that they **want** a major economic crash to occur. Remember that last time this happened (under another Labour administration) they had to go cap in hand to the IMF for a bail-out, and of course the IMF placed severe economic restraints upon the government in



return. If the same were to happen in 2005, undoubtedly it would be the European Union that would come to the rescue, and not the IMF. But, as a consequence of the terms of the rescue package, the EU would at that point take over complete control of our economy.

Every decision that a government makes is underscored by the economic power to make that policy work. If the government wants to enlarge the army or build more schools, it needs the economic power to put that policy into operation. The bottom line is that without any economic power or leverage our government would have effectively ceased to exist. Europe would then have *defacto* control over every aspect of our lives and Britain would no longer be a sovereign nation in charge of its own destiny. The EU could even, with a flourish of a petulant pen, withdraw the Civil List - simply as a cost-cutting measure you understand - and a thousand years of British royal history would come to an abrupt bureaucratic end.

While it would be tragic to see the end of Great Britain as a sovereign power in any circumstance, it would be nice to think that we went down fighting for our freedoms. But for a once proud and influential nation to be destroyed by a myopic banker in pinstripes is galling in the extreme.

Given these two widely separated scenarios, the obvious question might appear to be: Are Brown and Blair cunning or just plain stupid? However, in some respects the question is almost irrelevant - we already stand at the edge of this economic precipice and the only way forwards is down.



John Bean's Nationalist Notebook

Global Capitalism Brings Ruin to Africa

Because the BNP is primarily concerned with preserving Britain's European culture, as well as the historical ethnic make-up of the people of our British Isles, it does not mean that we should disregard the problems facing other nations, other races, in 'distant' parts of the world. The poverty of Africa is a case in point.

The old parties' answer is to throw money at the problem. New Labour's budget for overseas aid in general was £3 billion last year, with the African nations receiving the lion's share. Following Chancellor Gordon Brown's recent visit to some of the African Commonwealth countries and the announcement of his 'Marshall Plan', this is likely to go up to £4 billion this year - apart from the contributions we make privately to the various charities.

Brown also picked up Brownie points in humanitarianism by announcing that Britain would now pay 10 per cent of the debt repayments owed to the World Bank by some 70 poor countries (costing the British taxpayers another £billion). But hang on, it is the World Bank, a lynch pin of the global capitalists' empire, that sowed the seeds of these poor countries' economic collapse in the first place!

Much of the money that has poured into African and other poor countries over the years has simply leaked back again, often to bank accounts in Switzerland. The ordinary people have gained little or nothing. Too often this so-called aid has been purloined by despotic rulers and the armies they need to keep them in power. According to a study headed by a New York University economist, Bill Easterly, "roughly 80 cents on every dollar borrowed by African countries flowed back (to the West) as capital flight in the same year". Surely, it is far better that help that we can offer should take the form of equipment and materials, e.g. tractors, water pumps, good seed stock, etc, that would enable the people to improve things for themselves?

The political rulers of these countries and their business backers have become the market-dominant minority in each country, with the support of global capitalism. The simultaneous pursuit of free markets and so-called 'democracy' has led not to widespread peace and prosperity - for the majority 'under-class', but to confiscation, autocracy, and mass slaughter. Outside the industrialised West, these have been the wages of globalisation.

A classic example is what has just happened in the tiny southern African country of Lesotho. It stands to lose one quarter of its economy after the sudden ending of the global Multi-Fibre Agreement limiting textile exports from China and other Asian producers. At a stroke, quotas on these mass producers were lifted and they received unlimited access to America's clothing market. Unable to compete with cheap Chinese suppliers, Lesotho's once-thriving textile industry, and the country's only industry, lost its viability overnight.

The Lesotho textile company, Vogue Landmark, once made clothes for American buyers such as Levi Strauss

and Timberland and the factory only opened in 2003, when Lesotho took advantage of an American initiative which was claimed to help Africa. The African Growth and Opportunity Act in 2000 gave tariff-free access to US markets for African textile producers and created 50,000 jobs in Lesotho now all gone.

This is the global economy in action; fully supported by Gordon Brown and the rest of the West's governments and main opposition parties.

Who's Behind Kilroy?



Where will Grasshopper go to next?

Few traditional working class former Labour supporters are likely to fall for Blair's vague promises about stricter controls on immigration, particularly as he is seen to be openly wooing Muslim voters back into the fold and away from the Respect party. Such former supporters are unlikely to vote Tory in any numbers but, as his research people are telling him, they are likely to vote BNP.

How convenient, therefore, that super tan Kilroy-Silk, who never said one word on immigration control when he sat on the Labour benches in Parliament, will no doubt siphon off some BNP votes with his Veritas party. The BNP knows how much it costs to fight a hundred Parliamentary seats. Where does Veritas get the money to fight probably 300 seats?

BNP members who attended a Kilroy meeting in Ilkeston report that the Veritas election manifesto was a virtual crib from the BNP. How does this go with porn publisher Richard Desmond - who is one of the BNP's most venomous opponents - who employs Kilroy to write a regular column in the *Daily Express*?

Incidentally, he never made any critical comments about immigration during the many years of his TV show. He was sacked by the BBC because of a recycled article he wrote criticising Muslims in the Middle East that was published in the *Daily Express*.

When Kilroy was about to leave UKIP because its officials would not let him become its leader, the party's PR guru during the Euro campaign Max Clifford, said: "The worst thing that could happen to UKIP would be if he becomes a leader. He would take all their credibility away." He added the telling comment that Kilroy-Silk "was a legend in his own mind."

BBC's recent TV programme *Kilroy: Behind the Tan* revealed him to be full of self-admiration, a genius in his own belief whom the world had failed to recognise, with a cavalier disregard for the actual truth. More importantly, he failed to answer any questions put to him on his proposed

policies. His bumbling, ineffectual former UKIP colleagues at least looked honest.

If Veritas and UKIP again siphon off enough BNP votes to stop us winning a seat, there is some consolation in saying that their media promoters won't be able to perform the trick at the next election.

CRE Will Have 'General Oversight' On Race Inequalities

The racist witch-finder general and chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality, Trevor Phillips is, of course, a long standing member of the Labour Party. The following extracts from a speech he gave on 19th January show how much unelected power he now wields in Government circles. The speech was made at the launch of 'Improving Opportunity, Strengthening Society: the Government's strategy to increase race equality and community cohesion'.

"I was struck by The *Guardian's* write-up of today's announcement calling this a Government crackdown (on race discrimination) I like that. I also welcome the fact that the CRE will have general oversight of government progress in tackling racial inequalities."

In reading the following you must allow for the fact that 'our Trev' likes it to be known that he has a touch of humour; he has also let it be known that he has bust of Lenin on his desk.

"All this talk of targets is very pertinent as I am currently reading Joseph Stalin's biography, where he says that 'there will be no deviation from targets'. Now he had a very definite way of guaranteeing targets were reached. Fiona (Mactaggart), we haven't yet discussed legal powers to shoot permanent secretaries who miss their targets, but I guess that might be our next order of business."

UN Corruption

Even the most avid 'Guardianista' no longer enthuses about the United Nations being the foundation for a World Government, as we were told repeatedly back in the 60s and 70s. Its resolutions are completely disregarded, whether they be its criticism of Israel's treatment of the Palestinians, or its strictures against military action by the US and Britain against Iraq. Its complete ineffectiveness in organising immediate aid for the tsunami victims, as described in this column last month, confirmed that it is incapable of organising the proverbial piss-up in a brewery. We have long become accustomed to the financial drain on the taxpayers of the Western nations, whilst providing well paid jobs, mostly sinecure, for the boys and girls of the Third World. Now it is revealed that the UN is rife with corruption.

This first surfaced with the Iraq oil-for-food scandal, which allowed Saddam Hussein's regime to rake off an estimated £900 million that should have gone to Iraq's sick and starving. Until very recently, Kofi Annan, UN Secretary General, refused to allow an investigation. There were allegations that his son, Kojo Annan, was on the payroll of the Swiss firm Cotecna Inspection, which held a substantial oil-for-food contract, even after his ties to the

firm had been ended.

The UN official running the scheme was Cypriot-born Benon Sevan who, according to a recent report, secretly solicited tradeable oil contracts from Saddam after pressing for a change in UN policy that aided the regime. Although investigators said they could not prove that he had received cash as a result, they questioned Mr Sevan's claim that some \$160,000 fed into his personal bank account had come from a retired aunt in Cyprus. The Commission noted that she lived a quiet life on a pension.

Questions have also been asked about the role of the former secretary general, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, where the report details how he had "acquiesced" to the Iraqi authorities in their determined choice of Banque Nationale de Paris (BNP) as the programme's banker, despite stronger competitive bids from others.

The British National Party says that it is high time that we withdrew from this useless but expensive body. The five billion pounds plus annual cost could go, for example, towards higher salaries for our NHS nurses and doctors.

The Cause and Cost of the Housing Shortage

The Deputy Prime Minister, John Prescott, who would be lucky to get the role of a deputy dog sheriff in a third rate Western, is planning to demolish thousands of Victorian terrace houses across the north of England, including 20,000 on Merseyside. English Heritage has said that repairing and re-using old buildings (often better constructed than many new ones) was not only "greener" than demolishing them but also avoided the loss of social cohesion caused by mass-clearance schemes. Keen to avail themselves of the £500 million available under the schemes, the Labour and Lib Dem councils are ploughing ahead with the demolition of basically sound homes.

This is to happen while Prescott is busy issuing plans to tarmac over the remaining green areas of the South East and half of East Anglia. Yet we are still told by Nationwide building society (who obviously have a vested interest) that the number of households will exceed the number of homes available for them to live in by 2010. Do they, or Prescott, think that there must be some substance of truth in the BNP claim that immigration, whether black, pink, brown or white, is the prime cause for this housing shortage, this destruction of our countryside and of the escalation of house prices that have now gone beyond the pockets of many young people? If they don't, then they must be imbeciles. If they do, as is likely, then their political correctness prevents them from saying so.

A sad outcome of this action of the law of supply and demand that has forced up house prices is that in order to keep up the mortgage payments more than a third of couples cannot afford as many children as they would like. This is revealed in a market research project carried out by YouGov in January. Thirty-nine per cent of those who wanted a bigger family cited cost as the main obstacle. The survey found that the average of 1.73 children per couple (which would give us a shrinking population without immigrants) would otherwise rise to 2.8. 'British birth rates have dropped steadily over recent decades, reflecting the ever-rising cost of raising a child,' said YouGov. This is a significant hidden cost of the housing shortage.

PO Box 97, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 1WT, England. E-mail: identitymatters@yahoo.co.uk

» Demonisation, Not Law Enforcement

I was going to be in Halifax on April 6th to support Mark Collett and Nick Griffin anyway. Now I'm in the same boat as them, and proud to be so. Let's make it the biggest BNP demo ever!

member of the BNP that upset them. I did ask what other political parties he blocked, but he did not answer. The company is governed by Equal Opportunities Rules, the Sex Discrimination Act 75 & 86 and the Race Relations Act. Are they breaking any laws themselves or are they infringing my Civil Rights and/or freedom of speech, etc?
(As the BNP is a legally registered political party they have no right to block our website - Editor)

Tom Linden, Harrogate

>> It's The BNP Or Goodbye GB

The only party left in Britain today which can save this nation is the BNP. The others are all singing from the same song sheet and sticking their noses in the many troughs of this corrupt system. One more term of a Labour government will see another exodus of fine Brits leaving our shores for the former white dominions, only to be replaced by Afro-Asians, plus the dregs that other countries do not want.

There is no alternative but the British National Party. Let's get out and put out the message: It's the BNP or goodbye Great Britain, hello Britanistan.

Dale Mills
Chester

>> Don't Mention The BNP

At 49 I am on a City and Guilds qualification in English and Maths on a Government scheme. Recently a fellow student was on the computer looking for web sites of non-establishment political parties. I asked him to log on to the BNP site, but he found that it had been blocked. I said to him that this cannot be because the BNP is a registered political party. The Tutor overheard what I said and went mad. The IT Manager came over and said that he had put the block on because he thought the BNP "was the most offensive party in Britain" and if I had any complaints I should go to the Manager.

The next day I was sent for by the Manager and was told that if I mentioned the BNP again I WAS OUT. It was the fact that I am a

>> Leaflets In Envelopes

I worked for the Royal Mail for twenty years and we delivered thousands of various leaflets. I found that most were thrown away without being read, often in front of you. Then some companies started putting them in plain envelopes and people started to open them and read their contents. I know it would add to costs, but more leaflets would be read and in the long run it would mean less wastage and, hopefully, more supporters.

E.J.Tait
Essex

**>> Foreign Students At
Oxford**

We should object to Oxford and other top universities cutting the number of British students in favour of foreigners. It is essential for Britain's future that the cream of the intellectual crop should be our own people, as they will become powerful one day. It will also require reform of the universities so that they cease to teach globalist rubbish.

For Oxford to be giving priority to overseas students for lack of £95m per year is scandalous! If Blair and Co. had put the cost of the Millennium Dome into good investments, the interest alone would



The Three Card Trick


» T. Fredericks warns that as the General Election approaches voters should not fall for the old parties' same old con trick of "Do Not Waste Your Vote"

» It seems certain that in May there will be a General Election. The media will go into overdrive, the political pundits will write endless articles in the establishment press and TV will have a field day. The daily news channels will show endless photo opportunities of the three establishment party leaders flying here, there and everywhere and meeting nobody. However, the media's misinformation service will be delivering the same old propaganda message: if you do not vote Labour, Tory or Liberal Democrat you will have wasted your vote.

The old gang manifestoes will assure us that only their respective party has a cure-all panacea for Britain's problems. If the bore factor has not driven you out to the kitchen to make a cup of tea, you will have noted that their numerous party political broadcasts will reiterate the same theme.

As to Britain's problems, two questions must be asked:

AL CAPONE: "Capitalism is the legitimate racket of the ruling class"



who is responsible for them in the first place, and can they be solved by voting one of these three parties back into government? The rational answer to the first question is the old gang, the answer to the second question is, no. Logically, if one's incompetence is the cause of a problem, can one then claim to be competent enough to solve that problem?

Just consider the choices you are being offered: A multi-talented Prime Minister seeking a third term in office, a Conservative Party leader who is the answer to an insomniac's prayer, and Kennedy. Once again liberal democracy providing you with the opportunity of electing the leader you consider to be the least incompetent.

LACKLUSTRE TRIO

Come polling day the old gang will be relying on their 'Do Not Waste Your Vote' propaganda being successful. If so, and you vote for one of the lacklustre trio, then the Establishment will once again have performed their Paul Daniels'-style 'Three Card Trick' on you. Liberal democracy provides the voter with the illusion of power. It is true that the voter can, by casting his or her vote, decide who lives rent free in Downing Street for the next five years. However, as long as the voter continues to vote for Tweedledum, Tweedledee and 'me too' Kennedy, then the consensus structure of Britain's establishment politics cannot be changed; that's the conjuring trick, the slight of hand. Whichever one of the three cards you select, it will always turn out to be the joker, liberalism financed by capitalism. And according to Al Capone, a man who should know, capitalism is the legitimate racket of the ruling class.

The old gang have already agreed to the political agenda on which, if they have their way, the next election will be fought. All debate will be centred on the National Health Service and education. All three establishment

parties will assure us that only in one of their hands will the NHS be safe. They will stifle real discussion on the EU and immigration, despite Howard's promises on 'restrictions'.

Millions of pounds will be donated to the old parties, not by their members, but by international corporations and entrepreneurs. This money will be spent urging us to vote Labour, Tory or Lib Dem. But if we cut through the mock rhetoric of the hustings, what political choice do these parties offer the British voter?

All three support membership of the EU, all three accept scrapping the pound at some stage in the future, not one of them is prepared to halt the influx of asylum seekers. Not one of them is prepared to protect the jobs of British workers. All three are committed to the continued erosion of our civil liberties in the name of Political Correctness. As for Law and Order, we will be promised drastic action, but we will only see liberal inertia.

THIRD WORLD NATION

Over the last hundred years successive administrations drawn from these three parties have reduced Britain's status from that of an imperial power to a country on the verge of becoming a Third World nation.

Our country's infrastructure is falling apart, the railway system is outdated and breaking down, the National Health Service is in a parlous state, our manufacturing base is being exported to the Third World (over 1m real jobs lost since Blair came to power). Britain's coal industry has been eliminated, we now import coal despite the vast seams that still exist under our feet. A similar fate is facing the remnants of our steel industry. Britain's farms are struggling to survive. Our historic fishing industry has been decimated. In town and country alike law and order is on the decline. Economic immigration and health tourism are placing enormous strains on the nation's resources. Our daily life is controlled from Brussels. However, despite their ineptitude and sleaze the old gang will still continue

to play their 'don't waste your vote' trick.

But there is a sinister side to the 'Three Card Trick'. It is the fact that all three parties have the same hidden agenda, a commitment to 'internationalism', as required by their paymaster, global capitalism. To the global capitalist national boundaries and loyalties are restraints to power and profits and as such are not to be tolerated. The merging of Britain into a European federal mishmash, controlled by unelected faceless bureaucrats, and the erosion, through mass immigration, of Britain as a homogeneous state are policies which they require the old gang to pursue. Profits Before People is the guiding slogan of Global Capitalism, close down a factory in Yorkshire reopen it in India, exploit India's cheap labour, sling the Yorkshireman on the scrap heap!

A quote by Alex Carey in *World Orders Old and New* aptly sums up the political chicanery of the old gang and their paymasters: "The 20th century has been characterised by three developments of great political importance: The growth of democracy, the growth of corporate power, and the growth of corporate propaganda as a means of protecting corporate power against democracy."

So what's in a name? New Labour, Tory, Lib Dem; red, blue or orange rosettes. When the votes are counted and the old gang politicians are back on the gravy train, it will be back to the consensus politics of liberal democracy. We the British voters may believe that democracy means government of the people, by the people and for the people. But to the old gang, liberal democracy means government of the people by the elite on behalf of global capitalism!

So at the next General Election you can either play the 'Three Card Trick' and vote for one of the failed old parties and waste your vote, or you can use it wisely and vote for the establishment of a National Democracy by voting British National Party!

BOOK REVIEW: The Great Immigration Scandal

» By Alastair Harper

» Arguably the most perceptive book of 2004 on the hottest political theme extant was *The Great Immigration Scandal*, by Steve Moxon, the *Sunday Times* Home Office Whistle Blower.

Moxon, whose political origins lie in the Liberal Democratic Party, to which he apparently no longer belongs, is a straight thinker who does not mince words. He calls himself quirky, but after reading his eighteen chapters, which give an incisive account of his discovery of the Labour Government's twisted and illegal manipulation of the Immigration Acts whilst working in the Sheffield HQ of Home Office managed migration, one realises that he is a commentator and critic of extraordinary talent, turning his guns on our corrupt regime in Whitehall. He brought about the resignation of the mendacious Beverley Hughes, and if there were any real justice in our land it should have earned Blunkett, her



The book that brought Beverley Hughes down



malignant boss at that time, the order of the boot.

His next promised work on Equal Opportunities should prove to be a missile of comparable destructiveness to the rotting fabric of our New Labour Government.

His book is cleverly laid out, in that the day by day account of his discovery and disclosure of the illegal instructions and conduct of Beverley Hughes, then the immigration minister, in fast tracking immigrant applications without reference to the legality of their claims, is interspersed with chapters of deep analysis of New Labour immigration policy and its background.

These latter closely argued chapters flatten the current high volume Government argument for plugging the pensions gap which is the latest confidence trick in the long list of deceptions calculated to prove to the British people that there is benefit in swamping our country with alien immigrants. He is not the first to show that we would need to double the present UK population to 120 million in a few decades to keep up with the uneconomics of the idea of an immigration support ratio of taxpayers to pensioners. Moxon demonstrates that the pensions gap problem can be solved with a political will, if there is an age discrimination reform, a five year raising of the retirement age, a comprehensive development programme for economically depressed areas and a resolution of the Incapacity Benefit provision.

He draws attention to the seldom mentioned outflow of earnings from Indian sub-continental and African migrants back to their homelands rather than their retention in the UK economy. He draws attention to in-work claimable benefits in respect of dependents which Afro-Asiatic immigrants draw, thus nullifying their income tax contributions. He draws attention to the neglect of improved technology by many of our industrialists in the 60s and their preference for Asian cheap labour which altered economic practices have now converted that former labour to benefit-drawing unemployed. Unskilled immigrant workers were the last thing we in Britain needed in the 60s and even less so today.

Moxon draws attention to the argument of critical mass in different societies. Large countries such as the USA can swallow immigration to power infrastructure and development. In the UK the opposite prevails. We, under mass immigration, are undergoing a breakdown of services and facilities.

His references to scholarly authorities regarding the failure of immigration as an economic policy is fulsome and indicates that the liberal left has lost the initiative in creative doctrine and is now parroting outdated nonsense in this critical upper echelon debate.

NEAR CIVIL WAR

Chapter 8 on Migrant Enclaves tells us what many already know. If migrant numbers continue to explode it is not inconceivable that there could be an escalation to near civil war. At whose door will the blame for this be laid? If there is a shred of truth left in our world then blame will be posted through the sundry portals of the treacherous liberal left.

He opens up the vicious untruths of anti-racism hysteria. He flattens the nonsense of "a British Nation of Immigrants". He puts the spotlight on bogus students and



sham marriages and the appalling concealment of the actual numbers of persons from the Third World who have arrived illegally and are so doing each passing day.

His analysis of Health Tourism is deeply disturbing. Not only are the costs to the taxpayer colossal, the only figure discussed in public is the £50m - £200m that C.C.I. Legal Services, the debt recovery agency, believed was lost to the NHS through non-recovery of charges to health tourists. The cost reaches astronomical proportions when one realises that the vast majority of ineligible patients are not invoiced for medical services at all. We are talking billions of pounds. The HIV/AIDS caseload is now at the order of £500m and rising.

This chapter is the most devastating in the book and deserves to be read for its 13 pages alone. Any honest Briton who reads it and does not discard the liberal left is either terminally prejudiced or dim. The open door to diseased Third World communities will shortly bring about epidemics to the UK. With the NHS now bankrupt but continuing to trade, our outlook is bleak.

The Great Immigration Scandal is a measured text book for every citizen. It is written with zest and clarity and marks a turning point in responsible thinking in natural demography. Whether the translation of its conclusions in to practical political action will arrive soon enough to avert the cataclysm that must surely be the outcome of the treachery and criminal insanity that is our present immigration scandal, time alone will tell.

The book is available from
Excalibur, PO Box 116, Leeds, LS27 9WW



Excalibur

www.excaliburheritage.com - 07968 336 426

Please make all cheques payable to "Excalibur" and send to PO Box 116, Leeds, LS27 9WW. When ordering please clearly specify what item you require.

March 2005

Merchandise

Celtic Art Box Set



This beautiful collection of Celtic art books by George Bain contains 7 different books and comes in a hard bound box.

The set contains:

- Book 1: Knotwork Borders
- Book 2: Knotwork Panels
- Book 3: Spirals
- Book 4: Key patterns
- Book 5: Letterings
- Book 6: Zoomorphics
- Book 7: Man & Plant

£14 (inc. £2 p&p)

Union Flag Cuff Links



Hallmarked silver cuff-link sets, hand-made in the UK. These cuff-link sets are of the absolute highest quality and come complete with a beautiful Presentation box.

£32 per pair (inc. £4 p&p)

St Georges Cross Cuff Links



St David



Pendant

St Patrick



Pendant

Sterling Silver with 18" stainless steel chain

£20 each (inc. £2 p&p)

Giant BNP Mug

Holds over a pint!



£8 each (inc. £2 p&p)



General Election Fund

Help us keep up the pressure that is making everyone talk about immigration and the failure of multi-culturalism

Yes! I want to help the BNP run its most constructive and effective General Election campaign ever. Please find enclosed my cheque payable to 'British National Party' or 'British Heritage'.



£10



£25



£1000



£50



£100



Other:

Name:.....

Address:.....

Please send to: The Secretary, PO Box 907, Hull, HU6 9WY

Please send an SAE if you require an acknowledgement for sums of £25 or less

Subscribe To Identity

The following rates are for 6 or 12 issues respectively (please tick box as applicable):

British Isles £15 ☐ £30 ☐

Overseas surface mail £16.50 ☐ £33 ☐

Unsealed air mail Europe £17.50 ☐ £35 ☐

Unsealed air mail Middle East, North and South America £24 ☐ £48 ☐

Unsealed air mail Australasia, Far East £25 ☐ £50 ☐

Please Note: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling. If you are paying in any other currency, an additional charge of £4.50 is required with cheques and money orders and £2.50 with banknotes.

Name

Address

Postcode

Telephone

E-mail

All cheques etc should be made payable to 'British National Party' or 'British Heritage' and sent to PO Box 87, Ossett, Wakefield, WF5 8WN. You can subscribe online at www.bnp.org.uk. Photocopies can be used.

Identity Bulk Order Rates

5 - £9.25; 10 - £15; 15 - £20; 20 - £24.50; 25 - £29; 30 - £34; 40 - £43.50; 50 - £52.50; 60 - £62.50; 70 - £71.50; 80 - £81; 90 - £90.50; 100 - £100

Postage - £1.05 for 5; £1.94 for 10; £4.05 for 15 - 20; £4.34 for 25 - 30; £5.19 for 40 - 50